

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1- 29 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 29 have been allowed.

Lilenfield

Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Lilenfield (6,545,667). Item 16 of figure 4 was said to show the solid state touch sensor along a contour. However, item 16 is not a solid state touch sensor. Rather, it is described as a ball, with mechanical springs below it. The present invention is directed to a way of putting a solid state touch sensor along a curved, contoured surface. Such a contour allows the finger to move naturally. The placement of a solid state sensor in such a configuration is not obvious, as typically solid state sensors are placed on flat surfaces. When the surface is not flat, typically a different, non solid state sensor is used, such as in Lilenfield.

Claims 3 and 8 are dependent on claim 1 and are not shown by, or obvious in view of, Lilenfield for at least the same reasons. Claims 4, 7, 10-11, 15 and 26-27 similarly set forth the solid state sensor in the contour, and are distinguished for the same reason.

Claims 12 and 25 have been amended to clarify that the electrodes are separated by the portion of the housing that the finger contacts, not simply electrically isolated as in Mabusth. As amended, this claim is believed to clearly distinguish and not be obvious from Mabusth.

With respect to claim 28, applicant believes it is not obvious to combine Lilenfield and Mabusth to produce the invention set forth in claim 28. Mabusth shows the entire device being a touch sensor, as a replacement device for a mouse. There is nothing to indicate that it could be shrunk and mounted on a mouse, absent hindsight from the present invention.

Vaghefi

Claims 18-24 were rejected as obvious in view of Vaghefi. Vaghefi discloses a child's mouse in the shape of an animal, with sounds corresponding to the animal being produced upon activation. The examiner objected to the claim language of claim 18 being too broad, so

that it would cover this. Claim 18 has been amended to clearly set forth that the sound emulates the sound of a mechanical roller. Accordingly, with this amendment, Vaghefi is believed to be non-obviously distinguished. Claim 19 is dependent on claim 18, and is believed allowable for the same reason.


Claims 20-24 were rejected because the language was considered to still be broad enough to cover Vaghefi. Claim 20 has been amended to clarify that the event received is from a computer across a network from the pointing device and its local computer system. This is believed to distinguish any animal sound emanating in the mouse of Vaghefi, or from a signal in the computer to which the mouse of Vaghefi is attached.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Paul C. Haughey  
Reg. No. 31,836

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300

PCH:gjs  
60327632 v1